UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/660,143	09/11/2003	Steven W. Githens	ROC920030276US1	4972	
IBM CORPORATION, INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW DEPT 917, BLDG. 006-1 3605 HIGHWAY 52 NORTH ROCHESTER, MN 55901-7829			EXAMINER		
			NUNEZ, JORDANY		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2175		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			02/20/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/660,143	GITHENS ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Jordany Núñez	2175		

Jorda	nny Nunez	21/5	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on	the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>02 February 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLIC	CATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the sal application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1 periods:	: (1) an amendment, affidavit h appeal fee) in compliance v	, or other evidence, with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of	-		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONL	n SIX MONTHS from the mailing	date of the final rejection	n.
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).	• •		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension a under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortenes set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than this may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	and the corresponding amount o ed statutory period for reply origir	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance v	with 37 CFR 41 37 must be f	iled within two months	of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension the Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the	hereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
AMENDMENTS			
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prio They raise new issues that would require further considera They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); 			cause
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form appeal; and/or	n for appeal by materially red	ucing or simplifying th	ne issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresp	onding number of finally reje	cted claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			
 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 	e attached Notice of Non-Con	npliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).
 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s) Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable 	-· e if submitted in a separate, ti	mely filed amendmer	it canceling the
non-allowable claim(s).	•	•	-
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided by The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		be entered and an ex	κplanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and suffici was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and we have a sufficient reasons.	ne <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fails	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	e status of the claims after en	try is below or attache	ed.
The request for reconsideration has been considered but does See Continuation Sheet.	NOT place the application in	condition for allowand	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (PTO/S 13. Other:	SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/William L. Bashore/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2175			

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but are not persuasive. Examiner reiterates that references to specific columns, figures or lines should not be limiting in any way. The entire reference provides disclosure related to the claimed invention. Only Applicant's most salient points are addressed. Applicant argues that:

1) Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner's analogy fails to explain how the cited material, as well as Cox generally, discloses the above limitation. For example, the Examiner fails to explain how a list of user command options (i.e., "actions") could represent the recited subsets of transformation rules. See Advisory Action dated December 7, 2007 ("each action is a subset of a plurality of transformation rules (e.g., a view parameter may be changed, so that data displayed as a bar graph may be displayed as a pie chart)"). Applicants respectfully submit that a user command option to "select specific data for display" or to "change a view parameter" is not analogous to a transformation rule. Thus, the recited limitations are not disclosed by Cox. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the rejection is defective and should be withdrawn (page 9, last paragraph). Examiner disagrees.

As to 1), Examiner believes it is rather clear that in order to display a bar graph as a pie chart a subset of transformation rules take place which command the displayed bar to be transformed into the pie chart. Thus, list of a user command options or actions is indeed a subset of transformation rules when one of said user command options or actions is to transform a bar graph into a pie chart.

2) Applicants respectfully submit that a user command option to "change a view parameter" in no way describes graphical attributes of a requested graphical representation type. Thus, the recited limitations are not disclosed by Cox. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the rejection is defective and should be withdrawn (page 10, first paragraph).

Examiner disagrees.

As to 2), Examiner believes it is rather clear that when a user issues a command to transform a bar graph into a pie chart, graphical attributes of a requested graphical representation type are indeed described, for example, a graphical attribute of a pie chart, which is a graphical representation, is described and then displayed to the user.

3) Examiner continues to suggest that the recited abstract data structure templates are disclosed by, e.g., a "BarChart view object." Id. Significantly, the Examiner's analogy fails to conform to the other limitations of claim 2. That is, claim 2 requires a limitation of the abstract data structure being generated using the selected abstract data structure template. The Examiner analogizes the "raw data being analyzed as the abstract data structure." See Final Office Action dated September 25, 2007, page 7. Respectfully, the Examiner's analogy leads to a contradictory result and is therefore untenable. That is, the Examiner'analogy requires the raw data ("abstract data structure") to be generated using a view object such as "BarChart" ("abstract data structure templates"). Such a requirement is wholly contradictory and is not disclosed by (or even consistent with) Cox. That is, Cox does not describe "raw data" as being generated with the "view objects." Therefore, contrary to the Examiner's suggestion, Cox does not disclose abstract data structure templates, each associated with a specific graphical representation type (page 10, last paragraph). Examiner disagrees.

Cox teaches Bar cart view object. One of ordinary skill in the art would readily understand the Bar Chart View object to be used to generate a Bar chart. Further, one of ordinary skill in the art would readily understand that raw data is needed to generate a bar chart, and that the bar chart view object uses the raw data to generate display instructions to a display device, said display device ultimately displaying the bar chart. Thus, Cox clearly teaches "the abstract data structure (e.g., instructions to the display device) being generated using selected abastract data structure template (e.g., barch chart view object).